

REMARKS

In the Office Communication of 12 May 2008, the Examiner has objected to Claims 1, 13, 17 and 23 as having various informalities contained therein. Applicant has amended the Claims to correct the cited informalities.

Additionally in the Office Communication, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 13, 17 and 23 for failing 35 USC § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner states that the limitation of "the initiation of the execution of the scripting code" does not have sufficient support in the Specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. The phrase "scripting language" is first introduced at p. 14, ln. 22. Further, the Specification notes, at p. 15, ln. 1, that the "scripting language contains the procedures for handling the e-mail message." Later, on p. 15, ln. 8, the Specification refers to "scripting code." In Claims 1, 13, 17 and 23, as originally written, the "scripting code" is noted as "containing the procedures for handling the electronic record." Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification uses "scripting language" and "scripting code" interchangeably.

Additionally in the Office Communication, the Examiner has rejected Claims 5, 12, 16 and 21 for failing 35 USC § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner states that the term "registry" does not have sufficient support in the Specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. The term "registry" is first introduced at p. 18, ln. 9 in relation to the network user's workstation. An additional reference is made at p. 35, ln. 8, again in relation to the network user's workstation. In

an effort to make rejected Claims 5, 12, 16 and 21 read more accurately on the Specification, Applicant has amended the Claims to indicate that the computer maintains a "network user registry" and a "network user profile" (support for the "network user profile" can be found, at least, at the bottom of p. 18).

Additionally in the Office Communication, the Examiner has rejected Claim 13 for failing 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner states that the phrase "scripting code" does not have sufficient structure. Applicant has amended Claim 13 to more accurately support the phrase "scripting code."

Finally, in the Office Communication, the Examiner has rejected Claim 17 for failing 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner states that the phrase "computer readable storage medium having a computer program embodied therein" does not have sufficient structure. Applicant has amended the Specification to provide support for the computer-readable storage medium. Support for the amendment can be found in, at least, originally-filed Claim 17.

Based on the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, all Claims in the Present Application are considered to be in condition for allowance. Such action on the part of the Examiner is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner feels a telephonic conference would expedite the allowance of the present Application, it is suggested the Examiner contact the undersigned Attorney.

Applicant: Jacobson
Application No.: 09/175,589
Title: "Electronic Records Management System"
Attorney Docket No.: 065424.0004

Examiner: E. Colbert
Art Unit: 3694

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 13 October 2008

/ Timothy M. Morella /
Timothy M. Morella
Reg. No. 45277

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC
Ten South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606 7453
312 876 1700

CHICAGO\2538581.1
ID\TMMO